



Approved Minutes of the meeting of Heritage Western Cape (HWC) Archaeology, Palaeontology and Meteorites Committee (APM)

Held on 11 April 2022, Monday on Microsoft Teams at 09:00 Am

1. Opening and Welcome

The Chairperson, Dr Lita Webley officially opened the meeting at 9:00 and welcomed everyone present.

2. Attendance

Members

Dr Lita Webley (LW)
Dr Jayson Orton (JO)

Dr Wendy Black (WB)
Mr John Gribble (JG)
Dr Ragna Redelstorff (RR)

Members of Staff

Mr Olwethu Dlova (OD)
Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport (SBD)
Ms Zikhona Sigonya-Ndongeni (ZSN)
Ms Chane Herman (CH)
Ms Penelope Meyer (PM)
Ms Ayanda Mdludlu (AM)
Mr Robin George (RG)
Ms Corne Nortje (CN)
Ms Natalie Kendrick (NK)
Ms Cecilene Muller (CM)
Ms Waseefa Dhansay (WD)
Ms Sneha Jhupsee (SJ)
Ms Nosiphiwo Tafeni (NT)
Ms Khanyisile Bonile (KB)
Ms Natalie Kendrick (NK)

Visitors

Dr Gideon Jacobus de Jager
Ms Jenna Lavin
Ms Omelia M Ruiters
Mr Shaun Ruiters
Ms Alice Moropa

Ms Ingrid Eggert
Dr Graham Avery
Mr Lance Blaine
Ms Katie Smuts

Observers

None

3. Apologies

None

Absent

None

4. Approval of Agenda

4.1 Dated 1 April 2022

The Committee approved the agenda dated 1 April 2022 with additions and amendments.

5. Approval of Minutes and Matters Arising from Previous Meeting

5.1 APM Minutes dated 2 March 2022

The Committee reviewed the minutes dated 2 March 2022 and resolved to approve them with no additions or amendments.

6. Disclosure of Interest

- JG item 26.1
- JO: items 26.9, 20.10, 26.11 and 26.12

7. Confidential Matters

7.1 None

8. Appointments

8.1 None

9. Administrative Matters

9.1 Outcome of Appeals

PM reported on;

- Proposed total demolition of Erf 12, 231 Main Road Sea Point
- Erven 117431 and 153536, 24A & 26 Main Road, Rondebosch
- Proposed redevelopment on Erven 25516, 25517 & 25531, 1 Nelson Road, 21 & 25 Stanley Road, Observatory
- ERF 96, 40 Dirkie Uys Street, Franschhoek
- Proposed Alterations and Additions on Boschendal Cellar Building, OFF R310, Dwars River Valley Farm10, 167 Stellenbosch

9.2 Committee Workshop

A report is being prepared.

9.3 Membership of APM Committee

Dr Webley thanked Ms Cecilene Muller for her membership of the Committee and wished her well with her new appointment. RR informed the Committee of her decision to resign. This has left the Committee with a membership of five and no palaeontologist. JG noted the general shortage of palaeontologists, in the Western Cape, to assist with PIA reports. RR suggested the names of palaeontologists at Iziko Museums and at the University of Cape Town who could be co-opted until the end of the current term of Committee members.

9.4 Comments to DMR

The Committee noted that Environmental Authorisations were being issued by DMRE which do not take into account comments issued by HWC asking for further information. HWC does not have SOPs with the national government authorising bodies. However, the environmental practitioners should be informing HWC of the

outcome of the mining applications to DMR so that HWC staff can determine whether the mining authorisations include the recommendations of HWC.

10. Standing Items

10.1 Clanwilliam Dam – Rock Art panels

The Committee discussed the need for a conservator to assess whether the rock art panels, currently in the Living Landscape building, can be safely transported to the Clanwilliam Museum. SB discussed the need for a report on this and the method of transport to be used, as she was concerned that there could be damage to the panels. Staff to discuss with management at Heritage Western Cape the matter of the potential financial implications of the move and the need for the responsible authorities to become involved. WB to discuss with Iziko Museum conservators time frames for a visit to Clanwilliam Museum, or to issue a report.

10.2 Accidental Finds of Skeletal Remains

None

11. Site Inspection

None

12. Proposed Site Inspection

None

13. Site Inspection Report

None

14. Report back on Council

Nothing to report

15. Policy and Procedures

None

MATTERS DISCUSSED

16. SECTION 35 PERMIT APPLICATION

16.1 Proposed Analysis and Construction of a More Holistic Model of the PAP for Phase 2, by the Addition of Genetic Data from Faunal Remains from Archaeological Sites: Boomplaas, Die Kelders, Elands Bay Cave and associated Open Sites, Klasies River Mouth and Nelson Bay Cave: MA HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ IZIKO ARCHAEOLOGICAL COLLECTION

Case No: 21081119SB0813E

Phase 2: S35 Permit application and associated documents prepared by Gideon Jacobus de Jager were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

Dr Gideon Jacobus de Jager (applicant) was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee noted that Phase 1 of the project was successful.
- This application formed part of Phase 2. Interim approval was requested to continue with the project, but with a larger number of specimens and the inclusion of an additional site, namely Byneskranskop.

INTERIM COMMENT:

The Committee approves the methodology outlined in the Phase II documentation. The applicant to submit a complete list of the specimens to be analysed as approved by Iziko Museums. The site of Byneskranskop to be added to the list of sites.

SB

17. SECTION 35 PERMIT REPORTS

**17.1 Report on Removal of Accidentally Exposed Human Remains: House Ruiters 3rd Street, Shelly Point, St Helena Bay: NM
HM/WEST COAST/SALDANABAY/ST HELENA BAY/ ERF 2964**

Case No: 21081602SB1014E

Report prepared by Graham Avery was tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

Dr Graham Avery (Archaeologist), Ms Omelia M Ruiters and Mr Shaun Ruiters (owners) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee noted that the community engagement preceding the excavations, met the minimum requirements.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee approves the permit report by Dr Avery dated January 2022.

SB

18. SECTION 36 PERMIT APPLICATION

18.1 None

19. SECTION 36 PERMIT REPORT

19.1 None

20. SECTION 38 WORKPLAN

20.1 None

21. SECTION 38 WORKPLAN REPORT

21.1 None

22. SECTION 38 (4) HIA

**22.1 Proposed New Retreat on Farm Boschendal, Off R310, Dwars River Valley, Stellenbosch, Farm 1674
HM/CAPE WINELANDS/ STELLENBOSCH / BOSCHENDAL / PORTION 11 OF FARM 1674**

Case No: 20032005SB0331E

The Heritage Impact Assessment and associated documentation prepared by Rennie Scurr Adendorff were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

Ms Katie Smuts (archaeologist) was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee discussed the archaeological monitoring proposed during construction.

COMMENT TO IACOM:

1. The Committee approves the archaeological impact assessment by Rennie Scurr Adendorff dated February 2022 and recommendation on page 52 of the report:
2. The development team/site foreman should be advised of the type of archaeological materials that could occur on site;
3. An appropriately experienced archaeologist should conduct a site visit, once during and again after any deep excavation activities on site, prior to backfilling or construction, to identify any evidence for in situ, subsurface LSA material;
4. Should any significant, in situ material be encountered on site, work in that area must stop immediately, and HWC should be notified so that they can advise of the appropriate way forward; this may include further inspection and mitigation by an archaeologist;
5. Should any human burials, or potential burials be encountered, all work should cease in that area, and HWC should be notified immediately to determine the appropriate course of action.

SB

**22.2 Newmarket Social Housing and Mixed-Use Development Integrated Phase 1 on Erf 14888 0 1, Newmarket Street, Woodstock: NM
HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ WOODSTOCK/ ERF 14888**

Case No: 20112613KB1126E

HIA and associated documentation prepared by Rennie Scurr Adendorff were tabled.

Ms Khanyisile Bonile introduced the item.

Ms Katie Smuts (archaeologist) was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee noted that there were no visible archaeological remains on the affected property.
- Given the distance of the property from the former coastline, shipwreck-related remains were unlikely.
- The Committee commented that archaeological monitoring was appropriate.

COMMENT TO IACOM:

The Committee approves the archaeological impact assessment by Rennie Scurr Adendorff dated 7 September 2021 and recommendations on page 25 of the report:

1. Monitoring is recommended for trenching on site;

2. An overlay of the location, orientation and alignment of the Powder Magazine is to be provided to construction team to appraise them of the likely intersects with historic structures;
3. Where historic features are encountered in situ, work in that area of the site should be halted until HWC has been consulted, and the way forward has been established. This could include excavation and recording by an archaeologist.
 - a. Any remains of the old Powder Magazine should be recorded and mapped in situ, it is recommended that these remains, once recorded, should be considered for demolition
 - b. Any remains pre-dating the Powder Magazine, and related to the C18th fortifications and related structures, should be recorded and mapped in situ; it is recommended that some portion of these remains should be considered for retention and incorporation in the development, if feasible;
4. Should any human remains be encountered, all work on site should be halted, the area of exposed remains should be cordoned off as a no-go area, and HWC should be notified immediately of the discovery in order to determine the appropriate course of action.

KB

23. Section 34 - ALTERATIONS/ADDITIONS/DEMOLITION

23.1 None

24. SECTION 38 (1) NID

24.1 None

25. REQUEST FOR EXEMPTION/OPINION/ADVICE

25.1 None

26. SECTION 38 (8) TO OTHER AUTHORITIES

26.1 Proposed Enlargement of Storage Dam on Farm 1033 RE Langekloof 487 Malmesbury: NM HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ MALMESBURY/ FARM 1033 RE LANGEKLOOF 487

Case No: 21081015AM0810E

Heritage Impact Assessment and associated documentation prepared by ACO Associates were tabled.

Ms Ayanda Mdludlu introduced the item.

After a brief discussion of the item JG recused himself and logged off from MS Teams.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee noted that Springfontyn fossil remains would be hard to distinguish from recent material.

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee endorses the HIA by ACO associates dated March 2022 and the recommendations on page 31 and 32:

1. If any archaeological material or human burials are uncovered during the course of development, then work in the immediate area must be halted. The find will need to be reported to Heritage Western Cape and may require inspection and mitigation by an archaeologist. Such heritage is the property of the state and may require excavation and curation in an approved institution.

AM

**26.2 Proposed Mine Prospecting for Limestone on Farm 309 Widouw, Van Rhynsdorp: NM
HM/WEST COAST/VANRHYNSDORP/FARM 309 WIDOUW**

Case No: 21092903AM0103E

Heritage Impact Assessment and associated documentation prepared by Sativa Travel and Environmental Consultants were tabled.

Ms Ayanda Mdludlu introduced the item.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Mapping is not adequate and GPS tracks are not clearly distinguishable so the extent to which the site was surveyed for the HIA is not clear.
- Photographs are too poor for identification of artefacts and a scale is not always provided, or insufficient.
- Grading of artefacts scatters is not adequate. Artefacts currently graded as Low in the AIA, should be graded as IIIA, IIIB, IIIC or not conservation-worthy according to the HWC Guide to Grading (2016). The determination of significance determines the appropriate mitigation strategies.
- Only a small portion of the affected property appears, from aerial photography, to have been previously farmed. This impacts on whether artefacts are in situ or have been disturbed.
- An ECO may not collect artefacts, only a qualified archaeologist with a Workplan approval issued by HWC.
- The Committee commented that the collection of stone artefacts for teaching purposes at universities was an outdated concept.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The report does not comply with requirements of S.38(3), nor with minimum requirements for archaeological reporting as required by HWC. It is recommended that the services of an archaeologist who is familiar with archaeology of the West Coast is employed.

AM

**26.3 Proposed Construction of Wind Energy Facility in Swellendam: NM
HM/OVERBERG/ SWELLENDAM**

Case No: 20112507AM1015E

Heritage Impact Assessment and associated documentation prepared by CTS Heritage were tabled.

Ms Ayanda Mdludlu introduced the item.

Ms Jenna Lavin (heritage consultant) was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee was informed that Environmental Authorisation (EA) was granted in December 2021 despite the fact that the HIA had not been submitted to HWC for comment.
- The EA does not include the recommendations included in the HIA submitted to the APM Committee, particularly those relating to archaeology and palaeontology.
- The Committee expressed concern about this, particularly the need for a pre-construction walk down which was in the HIA, but not included in the EA.
- HWC staff to determine whether the EA was sent to HWC.

- The Committee considered that an Appeal to the EA would be appropriate if the timing allowed for this.

COMMENT TO IACOM:

The Committee noted that environmental authorisation was granted in December 2021 prior to the HIA being submitted to HWC for comment. The recommendations in the HIA regarding archaeology and palaeontology were thus not included in the EA. The Committee approves the recommendations on page 41 of the HIA by CTS dated August 2020:

1. A no-go development buffer of 500m for wind turbine infrastructure must be implemented around the farm werfs located within the development area
2. The Design Criteria outlined in section 5.4 should be adhered to
3. A pre-construction walkdown of the final authorised layout including the powerline route must be conducted by an archaeologist to identify any areas requiring targeted mitigation in the form of excavation or removal of heritage resources. A walkdown report detailing the findings of the walkdown and the final layout must be submitted to HWC.
4. The HWC Chance Fossil Finds Procedure must be implemented for the duration of construction activities
5. Should any evidence of archaeological sites or remains (e.g. remnants of stone-made structures, indigenous ceramics, bones, stone artefacts, ostrich eggshell fragments, charcoal and ash concentrations), fossils or other categories of heritage resources including human remains be found during the proposed development, work must cease in the vicinity of the find and HWC must be contacted regarding a way forward

AM

**26.4 Proposed Cultivation of Blueberries and/or Grapes on Farm 630 Rawsonville: NM
HM/CAPE WINELANDS/BREEDE VALLEY/RAWSONVILLE/FARM 630**

Case No: 21102111AM1021E

Heritage Impact Assessment and associated documentation prepared by CTS Heritage were tabled.

Ms Ayanda Mdludlu introduced the item.

Ms Jenna Lavin (heritage consultant) and Ms Ingrid Eggert (environmental practitioner) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee had no comments to make on the HIA.

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee approved the HIA by CTS dated January 2022 and the recommendations on page 21:

1. Should excavations exceed 0.5m (not anticipated as per the project description), a suitably qualified palaeontologist must visit the site to monitor the planned excavations. Should any buried archaeological resources or human remains or burials be uncovered during the course of development activities, work must cease in the vicinity of these finds. Heritage Western Cape (HWC) must be contacted immediately in order to determine an appropriate way forward.

AM

26.5 Proposed Development of The Grid Connection for The Jessa Wind Energy Facilities Near Beaufort West, Portion 1, 5, 6 and 7 of Farm 319 Portion 0 of Farm 432 Portion 10 of Farm 170, Portion 1, 5 and 6 of Farm 319, Portion 0 of Farm 330, Portion 10 of Farm: NM

HM/CENTRAL KAROO/BEAUFORT WEST / JESSA WEF

Case No: 21101408SB1102E

Heritage Impact Assessment and associated documentation prepared by CTS Heritage were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

Ms Jenna Lavin (heritage consultant) and Ms Alice Moropa (EAPs) was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee noted that three grid routes had been proposed.
- The Committee noted that the area is of palaeontological significance but that the PIA had not identified any no-go areas.
- The Committee discussed the 500m buffer around the three sites of IIIB significance.

COMMENT TO IACOM:

The Committee approved the HIA by CTS dated February 2022 and the recommendations on pages 67-68.

1. The following powerline corridor routes are not preferred from an archaeological perspective due to the likely presence of archaeological resources along the banks of the dry river courses in the valleys (as discussed in section 4.1 and 4.2):
 - a. Jessa Z to Jessa M 132kV OHL (additional river crossing not recommended, however, can be mitigated to acceptable levels)
 - b. Jessa Z to Jessa S 132kV OHL (additional river crossing not recommended, however, can be mitigated to acceptable levels)
 - c. Additional Servitude for Jessa S (i.e., Powerline Corridor Alternative 1 for powerline route alternatives to link each proposed Jessa WEF to Droërivier MTS) (additional river crossing not recommended, however, can be mitigated to acceptable levels)
 - d. Northern sections of Powerline Corridor Alternatives 2 and 3 (for powerline route alternatives to link each proposed Jessa WEF to Droërivier MTS) which fall within 1km buffer recommended around the N12
 - e. Eastern sections of Powerline Corridor Alternative 2 and 3 (for powerline route alternatives to link each proposed Jessa WEF to Droërivier MTS) which fall within 1km buffer recommended around the N12 (see Figure 5b)
2. Should the above Alternatives be authorised, this may result in negative impact to significant archaeological heritage, which may require mitigation in the form of micro-siting within the recommended buffer area, archaeological collection and/or excavation of any identified significant sites. However, despite the fact that the above-mentioned routes are not preferred, should the appropriate setback distances / buffers be adhered to, and the recommended mitigation measures implemented and strictly enforced, the impacts associated with these routes can be mitigated to acceptable levels and development allowed to proceed.
3. The following overhead lines (OHLs) are implemented:
 - a. Jessa M to Jessa S 132kV OHL
 - b. Droe to Jessa M 132kV OHL
 - c. Droe to Jessa Z 132kV OHL
4. The final development footprint for each respective grid connection project must be cross-checked against available palaeontological databases and satellite imagery by professional palaeontologist.
5. A pre-construction walkdown of potentially sensitive, unsurveyed sectors of footprint for each respective grid connection project must be completed by a professional palaeontologist and archaeologist.

6. Palaeontological recording and sampling / collection of valuable fossils threatened by development for each respective grid connection project (as per Table 9) must take place prior to construction activities
7. The Chance Fossil Finds Protocol is implemented during the Construction Phase of each respective grid connection project, with recording and collection of significant new finds by professional palaeontologist
8. A 30m “no-go” development buffer is implemented around sites JS010, JS036 and JS062 (all Grade IIIC)
9. A 500m “no-go” development buffer is implemented around sites JS055, JS094 and JS096 (all Grade IIIB)
10. Although all possible care has been taken to identify sites of cultural importance during the investigation of the study area for the three grid connection projects, it is always possible that hidden or subsurface sites could be overlooked during the assessment. If any evidence of archaeological sites or remains (e.g. remnants of stone-made structures, indigenous ceramics, bones, stone artefacts, ostrich eggshell fragments, charcoal and ash concentrations), fossils, burials or other categories of heritage resources are found during the respective proposed grid connection developments, work must cease in the vicinity of the find and HWC must be alerted immediately to determine an appropriate way forward.

SBD

26.6 Proposed construction of Jessa M, S & Z WEF in Beaufort: NM HM/CENTRAL KAROO/BEAUFORT WEST

Case No: 21101407AM1014E

Heritage Impact Assessment and associated documentation prepared by CTS Heritage were tabled.

Ms Ayanda Mdludlu introduced the item.

Ms Jenna Lavin (heritage consultant) and Ms Alice Moropa (EAP) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee commented on the palaeontological fossils, listed in the PIA, which had been collected by Wits University.
- The Committee noted that juvenile human remains previously reported in the area had been washed away in a river bank collapse.
- The results for the three wind farms are the same as those for the grid connections.

COMMENT TO IACOM:

The Committee approved the HIA by CTS dated February 2022 and the recommendations on pages 36 of the HIA:

1. The final development footprint for each respective WEF project must be cross-checked against available palaeontological databases and satellite imagery by professional palaeontologist.
2. A pre-construction walkdown of potentially sensitive, unsurveyed sectors of footprint for each respective WEF project must be completed by a professional palaeontologist and archaeologist.
3. Palaeontological recording and sampling / collection of valuable fossils threatened by development of each respective WEF project (as per Table 9)
 - a. Implementation of Chance Fossil Finds Protocol during the Construction Phase of each respective WEF project, with recording and collection of significant new finds by professional palaeontologist
 - b. A 30m “no-go” development buffer is implemented around sites JS010 (located within Jessa Z WEF project area), JS036 (located within Jessa S WEF project area) and JS062 (located within Jessa M WEF project area) (all Grade IIIC)
 - c. A 500m “no-go” development buffer is implemented around sites JS055 (located within Jessa S WEF project area), JS094 (located within Jessa Z WEF project area) and JS096 (all Grade IIIB)

- d. Although all possible care has been taken to identify sites of cultural importance during the investigation of the study area for the three WEF projects, it is always possible that hidden or subsurface sites could be overlooked during the assessment. If any evidence of archaeological sites or remains (e.g. remnants of stone-made structures, indigenous ceramics, bones, stone artefacts, ostrich eggshell fragments, charcoal and ash concentrations), fossils, burials or other categories of heritage resources are found during the respective proposed WEF developments, work must cease in the vicinity of the find and HWC must be alerted immediately to determine an appropriate way forward

AM

**26.7 Proposed Bulskop PV Grid Along with Associated on Bulskop PV Facility on Farm 432, 4/169, 5/169, 1/168, 10/170, Beaufort West: NM
HM/ CENTRAL KAROO/ BEAUFORT WEST / FARM 432, 4/169, 5/169, 1/168, 10/170**

Case No: 21091003SB0913E

Heritage Impact Assessment and associated documentation prepared by CTS Heritage were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

Ms Jenna Lavin (heritage consultant) was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee noted that the archaeological resources were of low significance.
- A single abandoned building (BLK055) was identified.

COMMENT TO IACOM:

- The Committee approved the HIA by CTS dated October 2021 and the recommendations on page 37 of the HIA with the following recommendation:
- No impact must occur to the abandoned werf identified at BLK055 and as such, a 50m no-go buffer around this site is recommended
- The HWC Chance Fossil Finds Procedure must be implemented for the duration of construction activities
- Although all possible care has been taken to identify sites of cultural importance during the investigation of the study area, it is always possible that hidden or subsurface sites could be overlooked during the assessment. If any evidence of archaeological sites or remains (e.g., remnants of stone-made structures, indigenous ceramics, bones, stone artefacts, ostrich eggshell fragments, charcoal and ash concentrations), fossils, burials or other categories of heritage resources are found during the proposed development, work must cease in the vicinity of the find and HWC must be alerted immediately to determine an appropriate way forward.

SB

**26.8 Proposed Development of Bulskop PV Facility and Associated Infrastructure on the Remaining Extent on Portion 0 Farm 423, Beaufort West: NM
HM/ CENTRAL KAROO/ BEAUFORT WEST / FARM 432**

Case No: 21091004SB0913E

Heritage Impact Assessment and associated documentation prepared by CTS Heritage were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

Ms Jenna Lavin (heritage consultant) was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee noted that the development of six adjacent solar facilities would result in significant clearance of surface soils and the destruction of archaeological material which may not have been identified during the initial survey. The density of survey tracks was low.

COMMENT TO IACOM:

The Committee approved the HIA by CTS dated November 2021 for the following six solar facilities:

5. Bulskop recommendations on page 40.
6. Gamka recommendations on page 39.
7. Hardeveld recommendations on page 39.
8. Hoodia recommendations on page 39.
9. Rosenia recommendations on page 39.
10. Salsola recommendations on page 39.

In addition, the Committee recommends a pre-construction archaeological walkdown of the six facilities:

The HWC Chance Fossil Finds Procedure must be implemented for the duration of construction activities

Although all possible care has been taken to identify sites of cultural importance during the investigation of the study area, it is always possible that hidden or subsurface sites could be overlooked during the assessment. If any evidence of archaeological sites or remains (e.g., remnants of stone-made structures, indigenous ceramics, bones, stone artefacts, ostrich eggshell fragments, charcoal and ash concentrations), fossils, burials or other categories of heritage resources are found during the proposed development, work must cease in the vicinity of the find and HWC must be alerted immediately to determine an appropriate way forward.

SB

**26.9 Proposed Hoogland 1 Wind, Beaufort West: NM
HM/CENTRAL KAROO/BEAUFORT WEST / HOOGLAND 1**

Case No: 21060101SB0818E

JO recused himself and logged off from MS Teams.

Heritage Impact Assessment and associated documentation prepared by ASHA Consulting were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

Mr Lance Blaine was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Because both Hoogland 1 and Hoogland 2 fall outside the REDZ zone, they are subject to Scoping reports.
- The proposed Hoogland 1 and Hoogland 2 projects are addressed in the same HIA but with different recommendations.
- Many archaeological sites of historical archaeological significance were identified.
- The Item was submitted for discussion but not for deliberation and comment.

ADVICE TO APPLICANT:

The Committee supports the HIA by ASHA Consultant dated March 2022 and the recommendations on page 88-89. With the following recommendations:

- The road around the stone walls of the Slangfontein farm complex must be carefully considered and realigned as required to ensure that no physical impacts to the walling will occur;
- A pre-construction survey of the entire authorised footprint must be undertaken in order to determine whether any further archaeological sites may need mitigation or protection through micrositing (if possible);
- The final layout must be evaluated by a palaeontologist to determine which areas, if any, need a pre-construction survey. These will be previously unsurveyed and potentially sensitive areas;
- If necessary, and subject to the agreement of Heritage Western Cape, a Workplan application should be submitted prior to the palaeontological survey to allow for sample collection during the survey;
- A palaeontological chance finds procedure must be incorporated into the EMPr;
- Landscape scarring must be minimised during construction;
- If road surfacing is required then low contrast materials such as concrete with brown exposed aggregate should be used, where possible;
- All areas not required during operation must be rehabilitated in accordance with the Rehabilitation and Revegetation Plan;
- If a CAA-approved warning system which only requires the red lights to come on when an aircraft is in the vicinity exists at the time of construction, then such a system must be used to reduce the night-time impacts to the sense of place;
- If such a warning system is not approved for use at the time of construction, then the proponent must investigate the development of a system and, if/when approved, it must be retro-fitted to the wind farm;
- Visually sensitive skylines, rock outcrops and steep slopes must be avoided as per the recommendations of the visual impact assessment;
- Temporary laydown and areas and batching plants should be located in areas approved by the visual specialists;
- Substations and O&M Buildings to be located in unobtrusive low-lying areas away from provincial and district roads where possible;
- On-site signage to be discrete, and billboards prohibited. Signage to be fixed as low as possible, preferably against a backdrop to avoid intrusion on the skyline;
- Security and other outdoor lighting to be fitted with reflectors to conceal the light source;
- In the event of decommissioning, the site must be rehabilitated in accordance with the Rehabilitation and Revegetation Plan;
- If the wind farm is approved and the final layout does not need all approved turbine locations to ensure a maximum of 60 turbines, then where a choice exists between turbines to be dropped, and all other factors are equal, priority should be given to dropping turbines in the high visual sensitivity areas and within 1 km of the R381, as well as turbines 75, 76 and 86 due to their proximity to the Slangfontein homestead which is a IIIA cultural landscape and turbine 82 which is in proximity to a IIIA LSA engraving;
- Replacement structures for the existing bridges on the local access roads must be designed to have a similar appearance to the current structures; and
- If any archaeological material or human burials are uncovered during the course of development then work in the immediate area should be halted. The find would need to be reported to the heritage

authorities and may require inspection by an archaeologist. Such heritage is the property of the state and may require excavation and curation in an approved institution.

SB

**26.10 Proposed Hoogland 2 Wind Farm, Beaufort West: NM
HM/CENTRAL KAROO/BEAUFORT WEST / HOOGLAND 2**

Case No: 21060102SB0818E

JO recused himself and logged off from MS Teams.

Heritage Impact Assessment and associated documentation prepared by ASHA Consulting were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

Mr Lance Blaine was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Because both Hoogland 1 and Hoogland 2 fall outside the REDZ zone, they are subject to Scoping reports.
- The proposed Hoogland 1 and Hoogland 2 projects are addressed in the same HIA but with different recommendations.
- Many archaeological sites of historical archaeological significance were identified.
- The Item was submitted for discussion but not for deliberation and comment.

ADVICE TO APPLICANT:

The Committee supports the HIA by ASHA Consultant dated March 2022 and the recommendations on page 89-90 with the following recommendations:

- The archaeological site at waypoint 1703 that will be crossed by a proposed wind farm road must be excavated prior to construction. Excavation should at least cover the area to be disturbed;
- The cable trench past waypoint 113 may run through the historic farm complex but must be sure to avoid impacting any ruined structures or other features in the vicinity;
- A pre-construction survey of the entire authorised footprint must be undertaken in order to determine whether any further archaeological sites may need mitigation or protection through micrositing (if possible);
- The final layout must be evaluated by a palaeontologist to determine which areas, if any, need a pre-construction survey. These will be previously unsurveyed and potentially sensitive areas;
- If necessary, and subject to the agreement of Heritage Western Cape, a Workplan application should be submitted prior to the palaeontological survey to allow for sample collection during the survey;
- A palaeontological chance finds procedure must be incorporated into the EMPr;
- Landscape scarring must be minimised during construction;
- If road surfacing is required then low contrast materials such as concrete with brown exposed aggregate should be used, where possible;
- All areas not required during operation must be rehabilitated in accordance with the Rehabilitation and Revegetation Plan;
- If a CAA-approved warning system which only requires the red lights to come on when an aircraft is in the vicinity exists at the time of construction, then such a system must be used to reduce the night-time impacts to the sense of place;

- If such a warning system is not approved for use at the time of construction, then the proponent must investigate the development of a system and, if/when approved, it must be retro-fitted to the wind farm;
- Visually sensitive skylines, rock outcrops and steep slopes must be avoided as per the recommendations of the visual impact assessment;
- Temporary laydown and areas and batching plants should be located in areas approved by the visual specialists;
- Substations and O&M Buildings to be located in unobtrusive low-lying areas away from provincial and district roads where possible;
- On-site signage to be discrete, and billboards prohibited. Signage to be fixed as low as possible, preferably against a backdrop to avoid intrusion on the skyline;
- Security and other outdoor lighting to be fitted with reflectors to conceal the light source;
- In the event of decommissioning, the site must be rehabilitated in accordance with the Rehabilitation and Revegetation Plan;
- If the wind farm is approved and the final layout does not need all approved turbine locations to ensure a maximum of 60 turbines, then where a choice exists between turbines to be dropped, and all other factors are equal, priority should be given to dropping turbines in the high visual sensitivity areas and within 1 km of the R381;
- Replacement structures for the existing bridges on the local access roads must be designed to have a similar appearance to the current structures; and
- If any archaeological material or human burials are uncovered during the course of development then work in the immediate area should be halted. The find would need to be reported to the heritage authorities and may require inspection by an archaeologist. Such heritage is the property of the state and may require excavation and curation in an approved institution.

SB

**26.11 Proposed Hoogland 3 Wind Farm, Beaufort West: NM
HM/CENTRAL KAROO/BEAUFORT WEST / HOOGLAND 3**

Case No: 21060103SB0818E

JO recused himself and logged off from MS Teams.

Heritage Impact Assessment and associated documentation prepared by ASHA Consulting were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delpont introduced the item.

Mr Lance Blaine was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Hoogland 3 & 4 are inside the REDZ zone, and the current reports represent the pre-application phase.
- Both Hoogland 3 & 4 are addressed in the same HIA but with different recommendations.
- The Committee discussed the significance of the rock engravings in Hoogland 3. They were situated on the edge of an escarpment, in proximity to the proposed wind turbines.

ADVICE TO APPLICANT:

The Committee supports the HIA by ASHA Consultant dated March 2022 and the recommendations on page 93-94 With the following recommendations:

- The various sites that will be directly impacted must be considered for protection through micrositing or else, if unavoidable, archaeological mitigation (recording, tracing and photography of engravings; excavation and sampling of artefacts) must be implemented. This affects waypoints 123, 124, 128, 131-132, 135, 168, 173 & 1835;
- The various sites whose buffers will be intersected and where this is not acceptable must be considered for protection through micrositing. This affects waypoints 123,124, 136, 137, 139, 182-186, & 1567-1570;
- At waypoint 1586 the cable must be laid on the northwest side of the road;
- A pre-construction survey of the entire authorised footprint must be undertaken in order to determine whether any further archaeological sites may need mitigation or protection through micrositing (if possible);
- The final layout must be evaluated by a palaeontologist to determine which areas, if any, need a pre-construction survey. These will be previously unsurveyed and potentially sensitive areas;
- If necessary, and subject to the agreement of Heritage Western Cape, a Workplan application should be submitted prior to the palaeontological survey to allow for sample collection during the survey;
- A palaeontological chance finds procedure must be incorporated into the EMPr;
- Landscape scarring must be minimised during construction;
- If road surfacing is required then low contrast materials such as concrete with brown exposed aggregate should be used, where possible;
- All areas not required during operation must be rehabilitated in accordance with the Rehabilitation and Revegetation Plan;
- If a CAA-approved warning system which only requires the red lights to come on when an aircraft is in the vicinity exists at the time of construction, then such a system must be used to reduce the night-time impacts to the sense of place;
- If such a warning system is not approved for use at the time of construction, then the proponent must investigate the development of a system and, if/when approved, it must be retro-fitted to the wind farm;
- Visually sensitive skylines, rock outcrops and steep slopes must be avoided as per the recommendations of the visual impact assessment;
- Temporary laydown and areas and batching plants should be located in areas approved by the visual specialists;
- Substations and O&M Buildings to be located in unobtrusive low-lying areas away from provincial and district roads where possible;
- On-site signage to be discrete, and billboards prohibited. Signage to be fixed as low as possible, preferably against a backdrop to avoid intrusion on the skyline;
- Security and other outdoor lighting to be fitted with reflectors to conceal the light source;
- In the event of decommissioning, the site must be rehabilitated in accordance with the Rehabilitation and Revegetation Plan;
- If the wind farm is approved and the final layout does not need all approved turbine locations to ensure a maximum of 60 turbines, then where a choice exists between turbines to be dropped, and all other factors are equal, priority should be given to dropping turbines in the high visual sensitivity areas, as well as Turbines 85, 90, 91, 92, 93 and/or 94 which are within the main part of the rock art landscape; and
- If any archaeological material or human burials are uncovered during the course of development then work in the immediate area should be halted. The find would need to be reported to the heritage authorities and may require inspection by an archaeologist. Such heritage is the property of the state and may require excavation and curation in an approved institution.

SB

**26.12 Proposed Hoogland 4 Wind Farm, Beaufort West: NM
HM/CENTRAL KAROO/BEAUFORT WEST / HOOGLAND 4
Case No: 21060103SB0818E**

Heritage Impact Assessment and associated documentation prepared by ASHA Consulting were

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

Mr Lance Blaine was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Hoogland 3 & 4 are inside the REDZ zone, and the current reports represent the pre-application phase.
- Both Hoogland 3 & 4 are addressed in the same HIA but with different recommendations.

ADVICE TO APPLICANT:

The Committee supports the HIA by ASHA Consultant dated March 2022 and the recommendations on page 94-95 With the following recommendation:

- The farm road to be reused adjacent to waypoint 1807 may not be widened towards the north;
- A pre-construction survey of the entire authorised footprint must be undertaken in order to determine whether any further archaeological sites may need mitigation or protection through micro-siting (if possible);
- The final layout must be evaluated by a palaeontologist to determine which areas, if any, need a pre-construction survey. These will be previously unsurveyed and potentially sensitive areas;
- If necessary, and subject to the agreement of Heritage Western Cape, a Workplan application should be submitted prior to the palaeontological survey to allow for sample collection during the survey;
- A palaeontological chance finds procedure must be incorporated into the EMPr;
- Landscape scarring must be minimised during construction;
- If road surfacing is required then low contrast materials such as concrete with brown exposed aggregate should be used, where possible;
- All areas not required during operation must be rehabilitated in accordance with the Rehabilitation and Revegetation Plan;
- If a CAA-approved warning system which only requires the red lights to come on when an aircraft is in the vicinity exists at the time of construction, then such a system must be used to reduce the night-time impacts to the sense of place;
- If such a warning system is not approved for use at the time of construction, then the proponent must investigate the development of a system and, if/when approved, it must be retro-fitted to the wind farm;
- Visually sensitive skylines, rock outcrops and steep slopes must be avoided as per the recommendations of the visual impact assessment;
- Temporary laydown and areas and batching plants should be located in areas approved by the visual specialists
- Substations and O&M Buildings to be located in unobtrusive low-lying areas away from provincial and district roads where possible;
- On-site signage to be discrete, and billboards prohibited. Signage to be fixed as low as possible, preferably against a backdrop to avoid intrusion on the skyline;
- Security and other outdoor lighting to be fitted with reflectors to conceal the light source;
- In the event of decommissioning, the site must be rehabilitated in accordance with the Rehabilitation and Revegetation Plan;
- If the wind farm is approved and the final layout does not need all approved turbine locations to ensure a maximum of 60 turbines, then where a choice exists between turbines to be dropped, and all other factors are equal, priority should be given to dropping turbines in the high visual sensitivity areas and within 1 km of the R381; and

- If any archaeological material or human burials are uncovered during the course of development then work in the immediate area should be halted. The find would need to be reported to the heritage authorities and may require inspection by an archaeologist. Such heritage is the property of the state and may require excavation and curation in an approved institution.

SB

27. SECTION 27: PROVINCIAL HERITAGE SITE

27.1 None

28. REPORT BACK FROM OTHER MEETINGS WHEN RELEVANT

28.1 None

29. OTHER MATTERS

30. ADOPTION OF DECISIONS AND RESOLUTIONS

The Committee adopted the resolutions and decisions. CM moved to adopt the decisions and resolutions and EB seconded.

31. CLOSURE

The meeting adjourned at: 14:00

32. DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 4 May 2022

CHAIRPERSON *K. E. Webley* DATE 11 May 2022

SECRETARY A. Brown DATE 11 May 2022